IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Application Number	10800938	Docket Number	CNTR.2072
Filed	3/15/2004	Group Art Unit	2132
Examiner	BENJAMIN E. LANIER	Customer No.	23669
Application Title	MICROPROCESSOR APPARATUS AND METHOD FOR EMPLOYING CONFIGURABLE BLOCK CIPHER CRYPTOGRAPHIC ALGORITHMS		
First Named Inventor	G. GLENN HENRY		

APPLICANT'S STATEMENT OF SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW

VIA EBC

Mail Stop **AMENDMENT**
Commissioner for Patents
PO Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Dear Sir:

In accordance with 37 CFR 1.133(b), Applicant submits this statement of the substance of the interview conducted on 04/15/2008. Applicant acknowledges receipt of the Interview Summary Form mailed on 04/24/2008, ad provides this statement to supplement the record

Brief Description of Nature of Exhibit/Demonstration
Not applicable.

Claims Discussed
Applicant's representative primarily discussed the standing claims, with particular emphasis on independent claim 1.

Prior Art Discussed
Applicant's representative specifically discussed the following prior art references:

* Kessler et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,789,147

Principal Proposed Amendments of a Substantive Nature Discussed

Prior to the interview, Applicant had formally filed Amendments to the claims via Response B, dated 02/03/2008. These amendments were directed towards clarifying that the specific device claimed is 1) a microprocessor (as opposed to a co-processor which is coupled to a host processor) and 2) capable of executing an application program (as opposed to a co-processor which clearly executes single instructions or threads provided by a host processor).

General Thrust of Principal Arguments Presented to the Examiner

Applicant's representative discussed how the two clarifying amendments summarized above provide distinction over Kessler and any other reference that teaches a co-processor approach for performing cryptographic operations. More specifically, it was noted that a co-processor as taught by Kessler is not a stand-alone device, but one which must be provided with single instructions or instruction threads from a host microprocessor. Secondly, it was noted that a co-processor is not capable of executing an application program, and such is the reason why that limitation was added to the independent claims.

The Examiner stated that using a broad but reasonable interpretation, a co-processor is effectively a microprocessor. Applicant's representative asked the Examiner if, under such a broad interpretation, if the following terms were equivalent: microprocessor, host processor, processor, co-processor. The Examiner concurred that such terms were equivalent. Applicant's representative respectfully disagreed, and noted that a co-processor was incapable of 1) standing alone in a system configuration, and must be provided with instructions/threads by a host microprocessor; and 2) executing an application program since a co-processor only performs a subset of the operations of a host microprocessor. Applicant's representative agreed that the Examiner's interpretation was indeed broad, but not reasonable to one skilled in the art.

Other Pertinent Matters Discussed

None.

General Results/Outcome

No agreement was reached with respect to the claims. The Examiner suggested that the amendments in the form of structural limitations may well provide the desired distinction put forth by Applicant.

Applicant earnestly requests that the Examiner contact the undersigned practitioner by telephone if the Examiner has any questions or suggestions concerning this amendment, the application, or allowance of any claims thereof.

I hereby certify under 37 CFR 1.8 that this correspondence is being facsimile transmitted to the United States Patent and Trademark Office on the date of signature shown below.

Respectfully submitted,
HUFFMAN PATENT GROUP, LLC

/ Richard K. Huffman /

By: _____

        RICHARD K. HUFFMAN, P.E.
         Registration No. 41,082
         Tel: (719) 575-9998

        04 / 24 / 2008

Date: _____